DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 404

EA 016 368

TITLE

Indicators of Quality Schools: II. User's Guide.

Draft.

INSTITUTION

Colorado State Dept. of Education, Denver. School

Improvement and Leadership Services Unit.

SPONS AGENCY

Department of Education, Washington, DC. Basic Skills

Improvement Program.; National Study of School

Evaluation, Falls Church, VA.

PUB DATE

NOTE .

May 82 15p.; For parts I and III and the assessment

instrument, see EA 016 367-372.

PUB TYPE

Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS

MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

*Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Measurement Techniques; Rating

Scales; Staff Orientation

IDENTIFIERS

Indicators of Quality Schools

ABSTRACT

The Indicators of Quality Schools instrument is designed to be used in school self-studies to identify priority areas for improvement or closer study. Uses for the instrument are outlined in this user's guide. Emphasis is placed on ensuring that the staff is oriented to evaluating school practices. The instrument may be completed by small groups collectively or individually. A detailed nine-step discussion is provided on how to summarize results after using the instrument. Included in table 1 is a blank summary form for plotting scores. Four questions are provided to help in the interpretation of category or item analysis results. Table 2 includes a copy of the Items Data used in the instrument. (MD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

INDICATORS OF QUALITY SCHOOLS

II. USERS' GUIDE

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION School Improvement and Leadership Services Unit

4 May, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
ECUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu
 ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
 position or policy.



"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Calvin M. Frazier, Commissioner of Education 201 E. Colfax Avenue Denver, Colorado 80203

A 016. 368

Acknowledgements:

The material presented here has been developed over a period of time since 1979. The project was funded in part initially by a Title II-Basic Skills grant to the Colorado Department of Education. The 1981-82 development was in part funded by a grant from the National Study of School Evaluation, Falls Church, Virginia, Dr. Donald Manlove, University of Indiana, Executive Director.

The quality indicators development has taken place in the School Improvement and Leadership Services Unit of the Colorado Department of Education. No single author can be cited. Those primarily responsible for its development include:

William C. Dean, Assistant Commissioner Eugene R. Howard, Unit Director
Kathryn De Pew Robert Ewy Joan Harrigan (deceased)
James Hennes Thomas Knauer
Sister Alan Thomas
Gerald Villars

COLORADO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dorothy Gotlieb, Chairman (First Congressional District)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•.	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	• ,	•	•	•	. D	enve	r
Jacquie Haughton, Vice-Chairman . (Second Congressional District)		•	•	•.	•	•	•	•	• •	٠	•	•	•.	•	•	•	•	•	Lak	ewod	đ
Donald D. Ament	٠.	•	. •	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	.•	•	•	•	•	Ilif	f
J. David Huskin (Fifth Congressional District)	•	•	• .	•	•	• _	•	• •		•	•	•.	•	•	•	•	•	Eر	ņel	6M0 0	ď
Frank Ricotta (Third Congressional District)		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• P	ueb l	D

INDICATORS OF QUALITY SCHOOLS

- I. Overview
- II. Users' Guide
- III. Review of the Literature on Effective Schools

Instrument to Assess the Educational Quality of Your School

II. USERS' GUIDE

USING THE QUALITY INDICATORS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

A. Introduction

The Indicators of Quality Schools instrument is designed to be used in a school self-study, such as those leading to school accreditation. The primary object is to identify priority areas for improvement or for closer study.

The assessment items come from the research on effective schools conducted over recent years plus some items that have been added to reflect agreed-upon good school practice. The research on effective schools has the limitation of looking only at selective outcomes (mostly basic skills achievement) and certain school models. Clearly not all school practices are included, but all the areas included are important to successful schools.

Some repetition of items may be noted. This repetition occurs because some activities will, if working well, have an impact on more than one quality indicator.

The purpose of the assessment of educational quality is to provide the faculty and others with a profile of the school. From this profile the staff can identify some practices or conditions that are strong; that are comparatively weak, and where there is agreement that improvement efforts would have the most pay-off for school effectiveness. Activities, programs, and projects can then be designed to strengthen those practices seen by the faculty as being potentially the most influential in improving the school's effectiveness.

Respondents to the mini-audits may be staff members, informed pupils, or parents, who are well-acquainted with the school's programs and activities. It would not, however, be appropriate to ask people who have little acquaintance with the school to complete the forms. For this reason we do not recommend giving the form to all students or all parents.

The Indicators of Quality Schools consist of 42 items and 203 sub-items each of which are responded to on two "What is?" - "What Impact Potential?" scales. This takes at least an hour. In some cases you may want to select certain areas for assessment, or you may want to omit sub-item responses on the impact potential scale.

B. One Recommended Use for the Instrument

- 1. Form a steering committee or school improvement committee or designate part of your existing school management team as such.
- The instrument may be used in a number of ways. The steering committee should decide on a recommended strategy.
 - a) Normally each staff member will fill out the forms.



- b) In administering this instrument you may wish to organize your faculty into small groups of three persons per group. Each member of each triad would then be asked to complete an individual mini-audit form. The triad leader would, however, encourage discussion and information-sharing regarding the items as the group proceeds through the instrument together.
- c) Small groups of three or four may fill out the forms collectively instead of individually.
- d) You may want to have students and parents also fill out the form.
- e) The steering committee may elect to use only certain sections for the survey or to split the questionnaire in half and have each person do only half.
- 3. Orient the staff. Be sure the staff is interested in looking at their school practices.
 - 4. The steering committee tabulates the results by item and by category (area) showing both frequency and mean (average) response. Have any comments typed out for review.
 - Items or categories showing little consensus and great diversity in response are discussed at a staff meeting. A consensus rating is reached. The subitem ratings can help pinpoint differences in understanding.
 - 6. Display the results for each category or area (Table 1). Through a group discussion of staff, and perhaps students and parents, agree on which one to three areas to focus on for improvement.
 - 7. Set up mechanisms to develop plans for improvement. Individuals may be assigned priorities in some cases. More often, one or more task forces should be developed to work out ideas and action plans for improving the school in each priority area. You may want to do a further in-depth study of priority areas, or you may want to collect some base-line data for future use. These task forces should have volunteers from staff and, where appropriate, students, parents, and citizens.
 - 8. Implement the improvement activities and report on plans and progress to all staff and advisory groups.

C. How to Summarize the Results

Follow these steps and you will be able to summarize the results of the quality assessment with a minimum of difficulty.

- 1. Separate the questionnaires by role group.
- Compute the average (mean) rating given by each respondent for each
 of the 12 categories. You may ask the respondent to do this at the
 time he or she fills out the forms.

- 3. Enter these figures in the boxes provided on the indicators instrument. Two figures are entered: the mean for WHAT IS and the mean for IMPACT POTENTIAL.
- 4. Since there is more than one respondent for each role group, compute the mean score for each category by adding all the mean for each category and dividing by the number of respondents. For example, suppose there are nine teacher questionnaires. Their scores on the Time on Task category (from the boxes) are as follows:

Respondent		What Is Score		Impact Pote Score	ential
Teacher 1 Teacher 2 Teacher 3 Teacher 4 Teacher 5 Teacher 6 Teacher 7 Teacher 8 Teacher 9	#	1.1 1.5 1.2 2.4 1.2 2.0 1.3 1.2		2.5 2.8 3.0 2.6 3.0 2.8 3.0 2.6 2.9	
	 .	.9/13.5		9/25,2	
•	• · · ·	1.5	•	2.8	

5. Plot these mean scores (1.5 and 2.8) on the blank Table 1 summary form provided on the next page.

School Table 1 Date Respondents INDICATORS OF QUALITY SCHOOLS SUMMARY PLOT OF WHAT IS AND IMPACT POTENTIAL SCORES 0,5 2.5 Monitoring Student Progress Instructional Effectiveness

WHAT IS

INDICATOR CATEGORY

1. Curricular Congruence

3. Leadership Principal

High Expectations

School-wide Norms

School Climate

Time on Task

9. Classroom Management

11. Parent Involvement

12. Planning Process

2. Assessment

IMPACT POTENTIAL

- 6. After computing in a similar manner the mean scores for the other quality school categories, connect the "What Is" scores with a black line. Then connect the "Impact Potential" scores with a red line or a broken line.
- Use a different summary form for each role group involved in the assessment.
- 8. Later you may want to compare responses of particular role groups by plotting them on the same summary form or by converting the summary grid into a transparency and superimposing the data for the role groups one on the other.
- 9. A similar analysis of items may be made using Table 2.
- D. Interpretation of the Category or Item Analysis

In interpreting the results of your analysis of categories or items you may find responses to the following types of questions of value:

- 1. Which practices or conditions are least developed in your school?
- 2. Which of the above categories or items are seen as having the highest potential positive impact on your school? Perhaps the faculty should consider a project to increase the degree to which these activities operate in the school.
- 3. Which practices or conditions are most developed in your school? What could be done to strengthen these activities?
- 4. Which of the categories or items are rated by the faculty as having the lowest potential for affecting the school's effectiveness in a positive manner? Does this mean that the faculty should spend less time in further developing these activities than in developing others?

ITEM DATA FROM INDICATORS OF SCHOOL QUALITY

I. CURRICULAR CONGRUENCE

AMER OBJECTIVES EXIST WHICH ARE CLEAR, VALID, AND SEQUENCED.

ERE IS A MATCH BETWEEN THE WRITTEN CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT, 1.º., THE STS REFLECT THE CURRICULUM.

ERE IS A MATCH BETWEEN INSTRUCTION AND THE WRITTEN CURRICULUM.

. 2. ASSESSMENT

E SCHOOL (OR DISTRICT) HAS ESTABLISHED EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT PURPOSES DEPRIORITIES.

VARIETY OF MEASURES OR INDICATORS ARE USED WHICH ARE APPROPRIATE FOR THE JECTIVES.

UDENT OUTCOME RESULTS AND OTHER EVALUATIONS ARE REPORTED TO APPROPRIATE BLICS AND INDIVIDUALS, AND THE RESULTS USED TO MAKE DECISIONS FOR PROGRAM PROYEMENT.

3. LEADERSHIP OF THE PRINCIPA

F PRINCIPAL MAINTAINS AN ONGOING, EFFECTIVE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, ARE THAT THE STAFF REGULARLY NEEDS NEW SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE IN ORDER TO HIEVE AND MAINTAIN EXCELLENCE IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.

E PRINCIPAL SUPPORTS AND ENCOURAGES THE STAFF, IS SEEN AS AN AGENT OF

ANGE, I.E., IMPROVEMENT, AND AS A STRONG EDUCATIONAL LEADER.

E PRINCIPAL IS SEEN AS A PERSON WHO INVOLVES THE STAFF AND STUDENTS IN ACHING DECISIONS.

E PRINCIPAL KNOWS WHAT THE COMMUNITY EXPECTS OF THE SCHOOL, AND ACTIVELY EKS PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN THEIR STUDENTS' EDUCATION.

IE PRINCIPAL SETS HIGH BUT REALISTIC STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE AND LETS IE STAPF, STUDENTS AND PARENTS KNOW WHAT THESE STANDARDS ARE.

4. HIGH EXPECTATIONS

IS SCHOOL HAS HIGH EXPECTATIONS OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL STUDENTS.

ACHERS GIVE REWARDS, PRAISE AND RECOGNITION TO STUDENTS FOR THEIR PERFOR-

.10

	4			
0	.1	2	3	Mean
			. ,	
				,
	в.			,
		·	•	,
	c			,
MI			1111	
ı				a .
•				
•	•			
*			4	
	. >			•
			1111	111111
		·		
\$	<u> </u>		11	



- 5. SCHOOL-WIDE NORMS: VALUES: PRACTICES AND POLICIES
- 14. VALUES AND NORMS ARE CONSISTENT THROUGHOUT THE SCHOOL AND ARE ACCEPTED BY STAFF AND STUDENTS.
- 15. SCHOOL POLICIES WHICH AFFECT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT GAINS ARE CLEAR AND HAVE STUDENT AND STAFF SUPPORT.

6. SCHOOL CLINATE FACTORS 🚙

- 16. RESPECT.
- 17. TRUST:
- 18. HIGH MORALE.
- 19. COHESIVENESS.
- 20. CARING.
- 21. CONDITIONS IN THIS SCHOOL SUPPORT A PLEASANT AND COMFORTABLE CLIMATE FOR STUDENTS.
- 22. SPECIFIC SYMPTOMS OR INDICATORS OF POSITIVE CLIMATE ARE GENERALLY HIGH.
 - 7. MONITORING AND FEEDBACK OF STUDENT PROGRESS
- 23. THE SCHOOL HAS AN EVALUATION PROGRAM THAT MONITORS AND REPORTS STUDENT PROGRESS.
- 24. EACH STUDENT IS MONITORED FREQUENTLY AND RECEIVES INFORMATION REGARDING HIS/HER PERFORMANCE.
- 25. TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS AND PARENTS ARE KEPT AWARE OF PUPIL PROGRESS RELATIVE TO OBJECTIVES.

B, TIME ON TASK

- 26. THE AMOUNTS OF TIME ALL STUDENTS SPEND ENGAGED OR ON TASK IS HIGH (MINIMUM OF 70% OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PERIOD).
- 27. ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, AND SUPPORT STAFF ENFORCE A POLICY THAT NO ONE DISTURBS A TEACHER DURING INSTRUCTION.

	Frequ	Jency ·	ů ì	
0		2	3	Mean
	·			
•		,	·	
		ነ	,	
		·		
7		}}	,	
				·
17.77				
		p.		
7	1	,	i .	

- 9. ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE
- 28. TEACHERS BEGIN THE SCHOOL YEAR EFFECTIVELY BY SETTING THE STAGE FOR LEARNING:
- 29. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING IS SUCH THAT ALL STUDENTS HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCCESS.
- 30. TEACHERS PREPARE STUDENTS FOR INDEPENDENT INQUIRY AND STUDY.
- 31. THERE IS WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FROM THE SCHOOL STAFF, PARENTS AND STUDENTS REGARDING THE SCHOOL'S MORMS FOR STUDENT BEHAVIOR.
- 32. TEACHERS HAVE AND USE A VARIETY OF DISCIPLINE STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING DISRUPTIVE STUDENTS.
 - IO. INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
- 33. TEACHERS CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT THAT MODELS HIGH LEARNING EXPECTATIONS.
- 34. TEACHERS CHOOSE INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES THAT PROVIDE GREATER AMOUNTS OF TIME FOR STUDENT-TEACHER INTERACTION.
- 35. TEACHERS USE APPROPRIATE DESCUSSION TECHNIQUES TO PROMOTE HIGH SUCCESS AND ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS FOR ALL STUDENTS.
 - IL PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
- 36. PARENTS OF OUR STUDENTS WORK WITH THEM AT HOME IN SUPPORT OF THE SCHOOL'S PROGRAM.
- 37. THERE IS A STRONG PROGRAM OF PARENT-SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATION IN THE SCHOOL.
- 38. THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE INCLUDING BUSINESS, OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND CITIZENS WITHOUT CHILDREN IN THE SCHOOL IS INVOLVED IN SUPPORTING THE SCHOOL.
 - 12. ACCOUNTABILITY, ACCREDITATION/ PLANNING PROCESS
- 39. THE SCHOOL AND DISTRICT HAVE ASSESSED THEIR NEEDS AND STRENGTHS AND IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT.
- 40. PLANS HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED FOR EACH IMPROVEMENT PRIORITY.
- 41. IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS ARE IMPLEMENTED, EVALUATED AND MODIFIED.
- 42. EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS EXIST TO REPORT STUDENT OUTCOMES AND IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS TO THE STAFF AND PUBLIC.

0	i	2 ,	3	Mean .
	ŀ	;		,
,			,	
			•	
	•		,	
				` .
•	1			
<u> </u>	1111	11 11	///////	
•		į		`

14